

Embracing Mentorship

By Betsey Olenick Dougherty, FAIA

ost architects in California are aware of the upcoming requirement (pending

regulatory approval) for the completion of the Intern Development Program (IDP) for licensure beginning in January of 2005. To many who feel that the profession of architecture needs structured training, it is long overdue. To others, the thought of administering one more program while conducting the business of an architectural practice is viewed as burdensome to the candidates and to the firm.

As a member of the IDP Implementation Task Force of the California Architects Board, and as a firm principal who has supported voluntary IDP for the last five years, I am here to share my story. When I entered the profession of architecture right out of school in the early 1970s, it was difficult to find a job and even harder to find opportunity within the profession. Stories circulated about

classmates who spent two years detailing toilet rooms. New hires were pigeonholed into mindless tasks.

Some lucky graduates found mentors who served as role models, and opened doors to the practice of architecture beyond the drafting table. That precious opportunity for mentorship is what IDP is all about.

As a practitioner, I was aware of IDP and that it was required for licensure in other states. I viewed it as administrative busywork that no one had time for. Approximately five years ago, I was approached by one of my young staff members who expressed an interest in participating in IDP on a voluntary basis. She was talented and motivated, so I agreed to serve as her supervisor while her previous employer served as her mentor. The

process of becoming familiar with the IDP program was an impressive eye opener for me. This young person took advantage of every opportunity I made available to her to complete a wide variety of requirements. She

Access Complaints – Enforcement Update

hile accessibility features are something architects address each day, the Board has only recently seen an increase in the number of complaints filed by end-users. The Board reminds licensees to be especially vigilant in assuring compliance with this portion of the California Building Code (CBC) due to its civil rights nature and the importance of meeting the standard of care on all professional services.

The Board is mandated by the Legislature to "regulate the practice of architecture in the interest and for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare. For this purpose, the Board shall delineate the minimum professional qualifications and performance standards for admission to the practice of the profession of architecture. The Board shall establish a fair and uniform



Board President

WCARB MEETING Hot Topics in a Chilly Spot

In February, I had the privilege of attending the Western Conference of Architectural Registration Boards (WCARB) Annual Workshop and Meeting in Anchorage, Alaska. We learned of the difficulties of practicing in a state where a winter walk to the store is an extreme sport. These challenges were the topic of a fascinating presentation on arctic design by a local architect, engineer, and landscape architect that kicked off the two-day annual event.

The two biggest issues of the meeting were discussions of the Intern Development Program (IDP) and issues surrounding reciprocity. National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) President Bob Campbell, 1st Vice President Bob Boynton, and Executive Vice President Lenore Lucey were on hand with others from NCARB to present and hear feedback on those and other issues.

NCARB's Director of Council Record Services Rob Rosenfeld, gave us a view into IDP's 22-year history and some thoughts on its future. He expressed NCARB's keen interest in the work of California's Comprehensive IDP Task Force. Rosenfeld's understanding of IDP implementation, along with his suggestions were very insightful. We look forward to working with NCARB as we move toward our January 2005 target.

The reciprocity discussion focused on removing impediments to individual practice and, eventually, international reciprocity when NCARB's requirements have been met. Among the identified impediments were requiring a degree from an National Architectural Accrediting Board-certified school, jurisdictional technical and legal exams, continuing education requirements, and long processing times.

Those of us from California came away feeling that everyone is working hard to improve our relationship with NCARB. The process includes continuing to educate NCARB on the issues we face as a state. With about one-fifth of the nation's licensed architects, California's diverse population, landscape, climate, high seismicity, distinctive legal framework, and massive economy create a demanding and complex setting for architectural practice.

In closing, I'd also like to congratulate Kirk Miller for his re-election to WCARB's executive committee. Kirk is California's only executive committee member, so his representation on national practice issues is important.

Alaska in winter was an experience. Next year's meeting in Santa Monica will offer a little California sun. ■

NCARB Debuts New Monograph:

Design Within a Community Context



♦ he latest National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) monograph is now available with the added convenience of online quizzing and immediate results. Design Within a Community Context features an exciting exploration into the architect's role in community planning. According to NCARB, "After reading the monograph, architects will better understand 'the dynamics affecting the design and siting of buildings' by recognizing and eventually implementing three important 'contexts': physical setting; the opinions and behavior of residents; and institutional planning restrictions."

Cost of the monograph is \$125 for current NCARB Record holders and \$195 for non-NCARB Record holders. After successfully completing the online quiz, architects can print a certificate of completion and will earn eight professional development units and eight AIA learning units in health, safety, and welfare.

Mentorship continued

grew as a professional and as an individual, and became an extremely capable and valued member of our staff. Others took note and approached me about their participation. I soon served as supervisor and mentor for several candidates working on their IDP requirements, and integrated my meetings with them into performance reviews or brown-bag lunches. Wow! With a little bit of support, I found I had gained an incredible staff with unbelievable talents at an early stage in their careers. I also enjoyed the opportunity to establish close working relationships with each of these people. In time, I supported staff within other firms as an outside mentor. We all learned from each other. I was sold.

At a time when we are all questioning the bridge between education and

practice, I cannot think of a better tool than IDP. Our profession is sorely lacking in mentorship. We have lost and need to recapture that one-onone relationship between mentor and protégé that has set us apart in the past. We have all seen photos of some of the greats of our profession surrounded by their staff during mentoring sessions. If it has to be mandated for that opportunity to happen, then so be it. The time I have spent supporting the efforts of my IDP candidates has come back to the firm in the dedication, talent, and expertise of an amazing group of young people.

My greatest fear is that firm principals will hesitate to embrace and support IDP due to concerns over the burden of time and effort necessary to implement the process. My message to those who are reticent is that YOU CAN'T AFFORD NOT TO DO IT. I am convinced that the statewide

implementation of IDP will enhance the value of our profession within the State of California. It will also open doors for all of us to export our services out-of-state where IDP is required. Staff members will be more knowledgeable, loyal, and dedicated when their firm supports their professional growth. I have observed that talented new graduates are drawn to firms who offer IDP.

Together, we must insure the future of our profession. Proper training and credentials are a fundamental part of our value. Through the mentorship program being developed by The American Institute of Architects, California Council, opportunities will be made available at the local chapter level for licensed architects to learn how to implement IDP within their respective firms. I am very enthusiastic about this program, and plan to be an active participant.

California Supplemental Examination The California Supplemental Examination was administered six times in 2002. Overall results for exams taken January – December 2002 are as follows:

TYPE OF CANDIDATE	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	TOTAL PASSED (% PASSED)	TOTAL FAILED (% FAILED)
Instate First Time	320	162 (51%)	158 (49%)
Instate Repeat	252	120 (48%)	132 (52%)
Reciprocity First Time	185	114 (62%)	71 (38%)
Reciprocity Repeat	63	37 (59%)	26 (41%)
Relicensure First Time	7	1 (14%)	6 (86%)
Relicensure Repeat	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
TOTALS	829	434 (52%)	395 (48%)

Architect Registration Examination California candidates took approximately 6,197 divisions of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) in 2002. Results are listed below. Score reports by school are available on the CAB Web site: www.cab.ca.gov.

DIVISION	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	TOTAL PASSED (% PASSED)	TOTAL FAILED (% FAILED)
Building Planning	701	464 (66%)	237 (34%)
Building Technology	647	421 (65%)	226 (35%)
Construction Documents & Service	es 762	592 (78%)	170 (22%)
General Structures	567	406 (72%)	161 (28%)
Lateral Forces	506	467 (92%)	39 (8%)
Materials & Methods	850	664 (78%)	186 (22%)
Mechanical & Electrical Systems	653	436 (67%)	217 (33%)
Pre-Design	833	569 (68%)	264 (32%)
Site Planning	678	429 (63%)	249 (37%)

Approximately 441 new architect licenses were issued in 2002.

Questions & Answers

IDP in California

he Intern Development Program (IDP) is the national structured internship program for the development of architects. IDP covers 16 areas of architectural practice and is administered and maintained by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). NCARB, as a voting body of state registration boards, sets policy in relation to IDP. While individual states establish their own requirements for licensure, they do not have a direct role in the governance of NCARB's IDP as a whole.

The California Architects Board is proposing to require NCARB's IDP as a prerequisite to licensure in California effective January 1, 2005 (pending regulatory approval). Listed below are some frequently asked questions.

I don't have an accredited degree in architecture. Does that mean I can't participate in NCARB's IDP?

No. An accredited degree is not required to participate in NCARB's IDP.

The California Architects Board (CAB) has established an entry point for interns who do not have a degree that has been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is consistent with the entry point established by NCARB for accredited degree holders. Simply stated, interns who have an NAAB-accredited degree can earn credit toward NCARB's IDP after completion of the third year in a professional degree program; California interns who do not have an accredited degree can earn credit toward NCARB's IDP after verification of three years of education and/or work experience equivalents based on CAB's Table of Equivalents, as evaluated by CAB.

When IDP is required, will I have to complete the whole program before I can be eligible to take the Architect Registration Examination (ARE)?

No. In California, candidates will still be allowed to take the ARE upon verification of five years of education and/ or work experience credit, as evaluated by CAB; however, most other states do require candidates to have completed NCARB's IDP prior to taking the ARE.

I'm not currently eligible for the ARE, but I took some exams a few years ago in California. Will I have to complete IDP?

It depends on how long ago you took your last exam. Candidates who have not taken an exam as a candidate with CAB for five or more years are "inactive" candidates. CAB purges the files of inactive candidates, but previous exam scores remain valid. An inactive candidate who wishes to reapply to CAB is required to submit the appropriate application and fee, as well as other required

documents (transcripts, Employment Verification Forms, etc.) to allow CAB to determine the candidate's current eligibility based on CAB requirements in place at the time of reapplication.

When NCARB's IDP becomes effective in California (January 1, 2005, pending regulatory approval), candidates applying to CAB for the first time and inactive candidates reapplying for eligibility evaluation will be required to complete NCARB's IDP prior to licensure. A candidate who is determined to be eligible prior to January 1, 2005 and who remains active in the exam process (no lapse of five or more years in taking exams) will be exempt from the IDP requirement in California.

How much does it cost to participate in IDP?

NCARB currently charges interns \$275 for compiling the Council Record for the first three years, which includes one transmittal of the IDP Council Record to a member board. An additional \$45 per year is assessed for each year beyond the first three years until IDP is completed. Students and recent graduates (within six months of graduation) may submit \$50 with their NCARB application and pay the balance, plus any annual increases, before the Council Record is transmitted.

CAB does not currently charge any fees for participation in NCARB's IDP and anticipates that there will be no additional fees charged to California interns for participation in IDP after 2005, above and beyond what is charged by NCARB. CAB anticipates that it will continue to charge the current \$100 application review fee when candidates apply to have their eligibility for the ARE evaluated.

If I complete IDP, does that mean that I can get licensed in any other state or certified by NCARB?

It depends on your other qualifications, primarily education. Each state establishes its own

continued page » 5

Questions & Answers

licensing laws, as NCARB establishes its own certification requirements. You should contact the individual state directly to find out their licensing requirements or contact NCARB to find out their certification requirements. Currently, approximately two-thirds of the states require candidates to earn an NAAB-accredited degree in architecture to become licensed.

I have heard that California will require a different type of IDP. What is the difference, what are the costs involved, and will it be accepted if I want to get licensed in other states or certified by NCARB? CAB will be requiring completion of NCARB's IDP as required by almost all (48) other states.

California is also proposing to require an additional overlay component (Comprehensive IDP) that will focus on effective communication between the intern and the supervisor, which will be driven by the review and discussion of materials relating to the Skill and Application Activities that are part of NCARB's IDP Training Areas. The intern will be required to produce "evidence" materials, which will be reviewed and discussed with the supervisor. There are two different types of evidence materials – 1) Work Sample, which should be a byproduct of the intern's normal work; and 2) Written Narrative, which will be a separate written document prepared by the intern describing a process or an understanding of a particular concept.

CAB is still in the process of finalizing decisions on issues relating to the implementation of IDP. Documentation relating to the verification of the overlay component will be signed by the supervisor and submitted by the intern.

CAB does not foresee any additional charge to California interns beyond what is charged by NCARB for IDP (see above regarding NCARB's fees). CAB also anticipates that it will maintain the records for the California component once a candidate has applied to CAB for eligibility evaluation and paid the appropriate fee.

Since CAB will be requiring the same NCARB IDP that is required by other states, the NCARB IDP Council Record for California interns should be accepted by other states for licensure and by NCARB for certification — provided that you have met all other requirements established by the state or by NCARB.

CAB is still in the process of planning for the implementation of IDP, as well as the evidence documentation component. Additional information will be included in future newsletters, as it becomes available.

If you have any additional questions regarding IDP or its implementation in California, please call CAB at (916) 445-3394 or email at cab@dca.ca.gov. ■

2003 Committees Update

he committees of the California
Architects Board had a productive
2002 and are moving full speed
into 2003 with a list of tasks to complete.
Each of these committees is driven by the
volunteer efforts of committed individuals.
We would like to thank those who
contributed their time in 2002 and let you know who is
serving for 2003.

Professional Qualifications Committee

Members: Ed Oremen (Chair), Kirk Miller (Vice-Chair), Gordon Carrier, Raymond Cheng, Allan Cooper, Donald Crosby, Jeffrey Heller, Christine Lampert, Mike Martin, R.K. Stewart, Barry Wasserman

The Professional Qualifications Committee is charged with ensuring the professional qualifications of those practicing architecture by recommending requirements for education, experience, and examinations. It also reviews the practice of architecture to ensure the Architects Practice Act accurately reflects areas of practice. This committee was formed in 1996 as a result of a need identified during strategic planning.

Activities 2003:

- Develop an IDP implementation plan addressing actions that need to be taken by CAB, practitioners, AIA, NCARB, interns, and candidates. Recommend best record-keeping method and complete the following: forms, handbook, and regulations (in conjunction with the IDP Implementation Task Force).
- Modify regulations to incorporate IDP requirement and begin regulatory change process with Office of Administrative Law (in conjunction with the IDP Implementation Task Force).



Committees continued

 Explore ways to incorporate and emphasize knowledge of codes in Comprehensive IDP and exams (in conjunction with the Examination Committee and IDP Implementation Task Force).

Intern Development Program (IDP) Implementation Task Force

Members: Ed Oremen (Chair), Cynthia Choy Ong (Vice-Chair), Allan Cooper, Mackey Deasy, Betsey Olenick Dougherty, Cynthia Easton, Jeffrey Heller, Ed Mojica, Ronald Ronconi, Paul Welch, Douglas Whiteaker, R.K. Stewart (Ex-Officio Member)

The IDP Implementation Task Force was created to assist the Professional Qualifications Committee with implementation of the IDP requirement, which becomes effective January 1, 2005 (pending regulatory approval).

Activities 2003:

- Develop an IDP implementation plan addressing actions that need to be taken by CAB, practitioners, AIA, NCARB, interns, and candidates. Recommend best record-keeping method and complete the following: forms, handbook, and regulations (in conjunction with the Professional Qualifications Committee).
- Finalize an IDP communication plan that includes strategies for initial communiqués, as well as a timed information release program to all constituencies (in conjunction with the Communications Committee).
- Modify regulations to incorporate IDP requirement and begin regulatory change process with Office of Administrative Law (in conjunction with the Professional Qualifications Committee).
- Explore ways to incorporate and emphasize knowledge of codes in Comprehensive IDP and exams (in conjunction with the Professional Qualifications Committee and Examination Committee).

Examination Committee

Members: Christine Lampert (Chair), Denis Henmi (Vice-Chair), Charles Brown, Glenn Gall, Richard Holden, George Ikenoyama, James McGlothlin, Carol Tink-Fox

The Examination Committee is charged with overseeing the content, development, and administration of the California Supplemental Examination (CSE), as well as reviewing the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) content and administration issues.

Activities 2003:

- Finalize statement explaining the rationale for the CSE for inclusion in Sunset Review; seek support from allied professional organizations.
- Explore ways to incorporate and emphasize knowledge of codes in Comprehensive IDP and exams (in conjunction with the Professional Qualifications Committee and IDP Implementation Task Force).

Communications Committee

Members: Cynthia Choy Ong (Chair), John Cary, Jr., Richard Conrad, Michael Dieden, Cynthia Easton, Jack Paddon, Ronald Ronconi The Communications Committee is charged with overseeing the Board's communications and identifying strategies to effectively communicate to key audiences. The committee serves as the editorial body for the Board's newsletter, California Architects, and provides strategic input on enhancing the use of the Internet to communicate with the Board's stakeholders. The committee also oversees a variety of outreach programs, such as the speaker's bureau and education liaison program.

Activities 2003:

- Finalize and implement the IDP communication plan.
- Create a PowerPoint presentation for the Board's speaker's bureau.
- Fine tune and promote the Board's Web site, expand online services, and solicit feedback from licensees.
- Update and monitor the Board's Communications Plan to increase focus on reaching consumers of architectural services and disseminate consumer information.

Regulatory and Enforcement Committee

Members: Frank Chiu (Chair), Larry Guidi (Vice-Chair), John Canestro, Richard Conrad, Richard Crowell, Fred Cullum, Robert DePietro, Robert George, Merlyn Isaak

The Regulatory and Enforcement Committee is charged with 1) making recommendations regarding the establishment of regulatory standards of practice for architects, 2) recommending and establishing policies and procedures designed to protect consumers by preventing violations and enforcing standards when violations occur, and 3) informing the public and licensees of the Board's standards and enforcement programs.

Activities 2003:

- Review the Board's rules of professional conduct and consider the need for modifications or additional rules.
- Monitor proposed changes to amend the 1998
 California Building Code to require construction observation services by architects.
- Promote increased communication with building officials to encourage cooperation in seeking code compliance.
- Implement the approved revisions to the Board's complaint disclosure policy and procedures and develop regulatory language to formally establish the updated policy in regulation.
- Continue consideration of amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 135 regarding associations.

continued page » 7



ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

CAB is responsible for receiving and investigating complaints against licensees and unlicensed persons. CAB also retains the authority to make final decisions on all enforcement actions taken against its licensees.

Included below is a brief description of recent enforcement actions taken by CAB against individuals who were found to be in violation of the Architects Practice Act.

Every effort is made to ensure the following information is correct. Before making any decision based upon this information, you should contact CAB. Further information on specific violations may also be obtained by contacting the Board's Enforcement Unit at (916) 445-3394.

MARK A. BARLOW (Atascadero) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$2,000 civil penalty to Mark A. Barlow, an unlicensed individual, for violations of Business and Professions Code section 5536(a) (Practice Without a License or Holding Self Out as Architect). This action was taken based on evidence that Barlow contracted to provide architectural services on two separate occasions; contracted to provide and did provide architectural services on a commercial project; listed the names of two architects and license number for one of the two, on his contract, without the architects' permission; and advertised his company under the Architects heading of the 1996/97 San Luis Obispo Pacific Bell Yellow Pages. Barlow appealed the citation and an administrative hearing was held. The administrative law judge's proposed decision upheld the citation and the Board adopted the proposed decision. The citation became effective on February 6, 2003. ■



Access Complaints continued

enforcement policy to deter and prosecute violations of this chapter or any rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to this chapter to provide for the protection of the consumer."

The Board has defined the practice of architecture as "offering or performing, or being in responsible control of professional services, which require the skills of an architect in the planning of sites, and the design, in whole or in part, of buildings, or groups of buildings and structures." The Board has also defined architects' professional services as including "compliance with the generally applicable codes and regulations, and assistance in the governmental review process."

When an architect contracts to provide architectural services for a project, it is clear that "compliance with applicable codes and regulations" including the CBC in its entirety, is the responsibility of the architect per the Architects Practice Act.

The Board through its enforcement program has and will continue to vigorously investigate any complaint alleging that an architect has designed a project that is not in compliance with the "applicable codes and regulations."

The Board's enforcement staff and architect consultants work closely with the local building departments and with the Division of the State Architect (DSA) to establish the codes and regulations in effect at the time of the work and

the interpretations of the code for that period of time. The DSA Access Compliance unit is able to assist the Board with the determination of compliance for the project per the specifications and drawings. The Board, based upon all evidence obtained through the investigation, will determine if violations of the Act have occurred and take appropriate action.

Accessibility compliance is as critical to a project as any other structural or life-safety issue. The architect needs to address these issues with the same diligence as every other aspect of a project. The Board certainly does!



Committees continued

- Upon the Board's approval of amendments to CCR section 135, develop revised regulations to amend CCR sections 134 and 135 regarding the use of "architect" and similar terms, as well as associations.
- Develop a plan to increase the Board's ability to enforce its statutory authority in areas where noncompliance is significant.
- Formalize and strengthen existing enforcement procedures and develop a plan with more specific actions to control unlicensed activity.
- Propose revised regulations to increase the administrative fines associated with Board-issued citations to the maximum allowed under Business and Professions Code section 125.9.



California Architects Board

400 R Street, Suite 4000 Sacramento, CA 95814-6238

Board Members

Denis A. Henmi, President, Architect Member Jeffrey D. Heller, Vice President, Architect Member Cynthia Choy Ong, Secretary, Public Member Gordon Carrier, Architect Member

Douglas R. McCauley. Executive Officer

Frank Y. Chiu, Public Member Michael L. Dieden, Public Member Larry Guidi, Public Member Wilfred W. Hsu, Public Member L. Kirk Miller, Architect Member PRSRT STD U.S. Postage PAID Permit No. 685 Sacramento, CA

Inside This Issue

SPRING 2003

Embracing Mentorship	1
Access Complaints	. 1
■ President's Message	2
■ NCARB New Monograph	. 2
Exam Results	. 3
Q&A: IDP in California	. 4
2003 Committees Update	5
■ Enforcement Actions	7
■ Do We Have Your Current Address	8
■ AB1144 Form	. 8

Heads up!

IMPORTANT REMINDERS TO ALL ARCHITECTS

Do We Have Your Current Address?

Keeping the California Architects Board (CAB) up to date on your current address of record will ensure that you receive necessary information on renewals and other important matters that are relevant to your architect license. The California Code of Regulations (CCR) requires that address changes be reported immediately to CAB. Failure to do so is a violation of CCR, Title 16, section 104.

If you need to update your address, please send written notification to CAB — either via email to cab@dca.ca.gov or via mail to California Architects Board, 400 R Street, Suite 4000, Sacramento, CA 95814. Please include your name as licensed, license number, new street address, city, state, zip code, daytime phone number, and effective date of the change.

AB 1144: Architect's Business Entity Report Form

If you haven't filled out and returned your "Architect's Business Entity Report Form," mailed to you last fall, please do so immediately. The form is required by a 2002 law (Assembly Bill 1144) revising the Architects Practice Act. AB 1144 requires every licensed architect to report to the Board the name and address of the entity (sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, or limited liability partnership) through which he or she provides architectural services. If you need a copy of the form, you can download one from the Licensee Information of the Board Web site at www.cab.ca.gov or call the Board at (916) 445-3394.